DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 032 255 SP 003 029

By-Clothier, Grant; Swick, James

Cooperation: A Key to Urban Teacher Education. Cooperative Urban Teacher Education Program, No. 2.

Mid-Continent Regional Education Lab., Inc., Kansas City, Mo.
Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
Bureau No-BR-6-2876
Pub Date Jun 69
Contract-OEC-3-7-062876-3076
Note-46p.
Available from-ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, One Dupont Circle, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 (Limited supply free)
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.44
Descriptors-College School Cooperation, Cooperative Planning, *Interinstitutional Cooperation, Organization, Program Administration, Program Development, Regional Programs, *Teacher Education, Urban Teaching
Identifiers-*Cooperative Urban Teacher Education Program, CUTE

The Laboratory's Cooperative Urban Teacher Education Program (CUTE), presently involving 23 Midwest liberal arts colleges plus four public and two parochial school systems in Oklahoma City, Wichita, and Kansas City, was organized in 1966 to develop and implement practical plans for cooperation in the preparing of teachers for inner-city schools. A study of "change concepts" led to the conclusion that higher education and public school personnel (those persons most affected by the change) must be involved to the fullest extent possible in the consortium's decisionmaking processes; the Laboratory would serve primarily as a catalyst in the distillation of new ideas, providing financial support to encourage institutions to undertake a high-risk, innovative program. A five-stage plan provides both a structure for the cooperative solution to problems and a set of principles to guide interaction among group members. Committees composed of a representative from each participating institution were formed to develop and conduct the program in each city; they successfully resolved such issues as financial responsibility, program content, faculty selection, and academic policy. (Included are guidelines for organizing a cooperative program and a collection of evaluative comments by the institutional representatives most active in program development. Related to ED 027 265.) (JS)

ED032255

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Cooperation: A Key to Urban Teacher Education

Grant Clothier
Coordinator
CUTE Programs

James Swick
Teacher Development Specialist
CUTE Programs

SP 003029

McREL

MID-CONTINENT REGIONAL EDUCATIONAL LABORATORY
104 E. INDEPENDENCE AVE., KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI 64106
Robert J. Stalcup, Director
Monograph, Volume 1, Number 2

June, 1969

COOPERATIVE URBAN TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM SITES – PARTICIPATING EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Wichita, Kansas

Associated Colleges of Central Kansas
Bethany College, Lindsborg, Kan.
Bethel College, North Newton, Kan.
Catholic Diocese of Wichita
Friends University, Wichita
Kansas Wesleyan University, Salina
McPherson College, McPherson, Kan.
Marymount College, Salina, Kan.
Sacred Heart College, Wichita
Southwestern College, Winfield, Kan.
Sterling College, Sterling, Kan.
St. Mary of the Plains
College, Dodge City, Kan.
Tabor College, Hillsboro, Kan.
Wichita, Kansas Public Schools

Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

Bethany Nazarene College, Bethany
Central State College, Edmond
Langston University, Langston
Oklahoma City,
Oklahoma Public Schools
Oklahoma City University
Oklahoma Christian College,
Oklahoma City
Oklahoma State University, Stillwater
Southwestern State College,
Weatherford
University of Oklahoma, Norman

Kansas City, Missouri

Avila College, Kansas City, Mo.
Baker University, Baldwin, Kan.
Central Methodist College, Fayette, Mo.
College of Emporia, Kan.
Diocese of Kansas City – St. Joseph, Mo.
Drury College, Springfield, Mo.
Kansas City, Kansas Public Schools
Kansas City, Missouri Public Schools
Kansas City Regional Council
for Higher Education
Lincoln University, Jefferson City, Mo.
Missouri Valley College, Marshall
Mount St. Scholastica, Atchison, Kan.
Ottawa University, Ottawa, Kan.
Park College, Parkville, Mo.
Rockhurst College, Kansas City, Mo.
Stephens College, Columbia, Mo.
St. Benedict's College, Atchison, Kan.
St. Mary College, Xavier, Kan.
Tarkio College, Tarkio, Mo.
University of Missouri – Kansas City
Westminster College, Fulton, Mo.
William Jewell College, Liberty, Mo.
William Woods College, Fulton, Mo.

This is the second in a series of monographs dealing with the Cooperative Urban Teacher Education Program. Others in the series are:

Innovation In The Inner City: A Report on the Cooperative Urban Teacher Education Program. Published in January, 1969.

Curriculum Guidelines: Implementation of an Inner-City Teacher Education Program. To be published in preliminary form August, 1969.

Other related materials, such as bibliographies and technical reports may be obtained upon request.

Published by the Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory, a private non-profit corporation supported in part as a regional educational laboratory by funds from the United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare under contract number OEC-3-7-062876-3076. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the Office of Education should be inferred.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This monograph springs from the efforts of many people dedicated to the improvement of inner-city education. With the realization that improvement of teaching skills is prerequisite to pupil growth, these people have devoted time and energy to forming cooperative relationships between schools and institutions of higher education in order to provide a quality urban teacher education program. Their efforts are gratefully acknowledged.

Although many professional people from each cooperating institution have contributed to the success of this program, space will permit mention of only a few. Lowell Gish, Baker University; Dale Jantze, Friends University; and Jack Parker, University of Oklahoma have served ably as chairmen of Urban Teacher Education Committees. Robert Wheeler, Kansas City, Missouri, Assistant Superintendent for Urban Education, and his staff also deserve special mention. Their strenuous efforts to initiate the program and their continued support have served as a model for public school participation in teacher education activities.

In addition to the representatives of participating institutions, we express our appreciation to Charlotte Nichols, Director of the Oklahoma City program, and to James Abbott, Director of the Wichita program, for organizing and developing cooperative activities in their respective locations.

Appreciation is also expressed to those institutions and agencies that contributed to help make possible the program: They are National NDEA Institute for Advanced Study in Teaching Disadvantaged Youth, the Danforth Foundation, the participating colleges and schools, and the Multi-Purpose Training Center of the University of Missouri—Kansas City.

Finally, we express our thanks to Helen Coggs and Ruth Simmons for their patience in typing the many drafts necessary for the completion of this manuscript.

G.C.
J.S.

CONTENTS

PREFACE v

PROLOGUE 1

THE PROBLEM 4

THE PLAN FOR COOPERATIVE CHANGE 9

PROCEDURES FOR COOPERATIVE ACTION 17

Cooperation Among Educational Institutions 17

Developing an Organization 18

Financial Support 20

Content of the Program 21

Selection of Faculty Members 22

Eligibility for the Program 22

Enrollment and Academic Credit 23

Tuition and Costs 23

Cooperation with Non-Educational Organizations 24

ORGANIZING A COOPERATIVE PROGRAM 26

PERCEPTIONS OF URBAN TEACHER EDUCATION REPRESENTATIVES 30

The Curriculum 30

Continued Operation Without Outside Funding 31

Participation in Decision-Making 32

Expected Outcomes 32

Problems 33

EPILOGUE 35

REFERENCES 38

PREFACE

This monograph is one of three in a series being produced by the Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory to provide a readable and inexpensive package of materials which will describe the Laboratory's program in inner-city teacher education. The first document in the series, *Innovation in the Inner City,* a report on the Cooperative Urban Teacher Education program, describes the rationale, objectives, major concepts, and activities of the program and presents brief statements dealing with the assessment of the program and summarizing what we have learned in that effort.

The present publication deals primarily with the development and operation of the consortium of school systems, colleges, universities, and other agencies necessary to operate successfully an effective inner-city teacher education program.

There is, of course, no absolute assurance that merely bringing together a group of cooperating institutions and agencies will assure the success of an educational effort as complex as that of improving education in the inner city; one can, however, be reasonably sure that without such cooperative endeavors an effort such as this will not be successful. Therefore, every effort was expended by the Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory to secure and promote the cooperation and commitment of a wide variety of institutions and agencies in this endeavor.

Readers will probably be most interested in the guidelines for establishing such a consortium, but we urge that equal attention be given to those parts of the publication which identify the rationale, the assumptions, and the principles which led to the establishment of the guidelines. We further urge that equally careful attention be given to the discussion of major issues which were amicably and successfully resolved only through a cooperative effort.

The information presented here represents still another step

the Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory has taken in its efforts to provide a meaningful, realistic, and attainable method for meeting the critical educational problems which face the inner cities of America.

Robert J. Stalcup
Director
Mid-continent Regional
Educational Laboratory

PROLOGUE

The Cooperative Urban Teacher Education program developed as a result of three separate and seemingly unrelated events occurring in the first half of 1966. In February, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education presented its Distinguished Achievement Award to Central Missouri State College for the Inner-City Teacher Education project. This project was a joint venture between the college and the Kansas City, Missouri, public school system. It was designed to improve the preparation of the teachers entering inner-city schools.

On June 1, 1966, the Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory, a non-profit, private corporation came into being. This Laboratory, one of 20 such organizations authorized under Title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965, Public Law 89-10, administered by the United States Office of Education, has as its major objective the improvement of educational practice in an area consisting of the major portions of Kansas, Missouri, Oklahoma, and Nebraska.

Also in June, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education received a grant from the United States Office of Education, under Title XI of the National Defense Education Act, to organize the National NDEA Institute for Advanced Study in Teaching Disadvantaged Youth. This Institute was created to improve programs for personnel who engaged in or were preparing to engage in the teaching of disdavantaged youth. Colleges and universities, in cooperation with school districts, were invited to develop the components of a national program in order to:

(a) identify important issues in the preparation of teachers for the disadvantaged,

(b) clarify basic assumptions about the manner in which the issues might be resolved and specify the implications of these assumptions for the preparation of teachers for the disadvantaged, and

(c) conduct pilot projects or training programs which would be concerned with the identified issues.

At this time the director of the Central Missouri State College Inner-City Teacher Education program joined the Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory. Shortly after joining the Laboratory, he met with a few representatives of private liberal arts institutions who were interested in the problems of urban education. From these conversations came the realization that liberal arts colleges offer a large, untapped source of potential inner-city teachers. Growing out of these circumstances, a meeting of representatives from 13 liberal arts colleges in Missouri and Kansas, the public school systems of Kansas City, Missouri, and Kansas City, Kansas, and the Mid-continent Educational Laboratory was held in the summer of 1966. These representatives were unanimous in their desire to explore methods for developing a cooperative program, and a decision was made to hold further exploratory organizational meetings. It was further agreed that a proposal should be submitted to the National NDEA Institute requesting funds for the development of such a program.

Out of subsequent meetings came a name for the group—The Cooperative Urban Teacher Education Program (CUTE)—and an organizational structure. It was agreed that each participating institution would be entitled to one representative on the Urban Teacher Education Committee, and since students were to come from participating institutions, the program must conform to the standards of these institutions. Therefore, the Committee assumed responsibility for the development of the program, determining the policies guiding its operation, selecting participants for the program, and approving the instructional staff.

The cooperative aspects of the program were based on the Urban Semester Program model developed by the Associated Colleges of the Midwest, under the direction of Helen Berwald. The Inner-City Teacher Education program of Central Missouri State College served as a prototype for preliminary thinking concerning program activities. The program was financed by a planning grant from the National NDEA Institute for Advanced Study in

Teaching Disadvantaged Youth; a grant from the Danforth Foundation; tuition rebates by participating colleges; and support from the two Kansas City public school systems, the Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory, and the Multi-Purpose Training Center at the University of Missouri–Kansas City.

Encouraged by the success of the Kansas City venture and by an additional grant from the Danforth Foundation, the program was expanded in 1968 to include educational institutions in and around two additional metropolitan areas, Wichita, Kansas, and Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. These programs are based on the original model, with adaptations to meet the peculiar circumstances of the individual center. At the present time, 38 institutions of higher education, 4 public, and 2 parochial school systems throughout a three-state region are conducting cooperative, pre-service teacher education programs to prepare teachers for inner-city schools.

This monograph is a description of the planning and procedures utilized to establish cooperative relationships in order to achieve a common goal. It is hoped that such a description will provide a worthwhile contribution to the educational literature on a topic of vital importance to contemporary society.

THE PROBLEM

> *If a nation expects to be ignorant and free, in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and never will be.*
> Thomas Jefferson

Clearly our society faces the grim choice of accepting accelerated social change or paralyzing chaos. Education can play a vital role in the making of this choice. Historically, educational leaders have too often failed to assert aggressive leadership in assisting society make wise choices. If the traditional American faith in the efficacy of education is to be justified, such leadership is imperative. Of the many problems facing the educational community, three concerns relevant to this report demand immediate, positive action.

First, educators have neglected the responsibility to provide adequate educational opportunities for children populating inner-city schools. The problem of preparing teachers competent to work in urban settings where a wide gulf exists between middle-class oriented teachers and inner-city children is particularly acute. This failure has been so widely discussed that it hardly needs additional documentation. However, McCloskey (1967) states the problem succinctly in the following statement:

> Many teachers assigned to core city schools have had little or no preparation for working with impoverished children. . . .most teachers are too immersed in middle-class outlooks to teach disadvantaged children successfully. . . .difficulties are accentuated when teachers with the least experience are assigned to slum schools and, more so, when supervision is inadequate. . . .in many schools half of the teachers are substitutes. . . .to make matters worse, teacher turnover in depressed area schools is exceptionally high. In some, it reaches sixty-one percent each year. Short tenure decreases teachers' opportunity to acquire an understanding of disadvantaged pupils. Adding to the disparities inherent in high turnover rates, some competent teachers refuse to work in "undesirable neighborhoods."

Equally depressing is the report by Klopf and Bowman (1965) that less than ten percent of the member institutions of the

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education reported specific programs for preparing teachers for inner-city schools. There is some encouraging evidence of a growing awareness of this explosive problem by educational leaders, but the failure to move rapidly with decisive, constructive plans seems inexcusable.

Second, educators have for some time agreed upon the necessity for cooperative school-college relationships in the preparation of teachers; however, they have been slow to develop and implement practical plans for such cooperation. A survey conducted by the Southwest Educational Regional Laboratory (1968), covering the states of Texas and Louisiana, resulted in the following conclusions:

(a) there is little evidence of carefully planned collaboration between teacher education and public schools toward the provision of systematic laboratory experiences with disadvantaged children;

(b) educators should take steps to make public schools centers of learning for both children and teachers, and public schools, colleges, and universities should be developed to the point where each is considered an extension of the other in regard to teacher training;

(c) the discrepancy between belief and practice in teacher education reveals limited promise for developing imaginative programs for the disadvantaged; it is imperative that ways be found to involve more institutions in a comprehensive attack upon educational problems imposed by impoverished living.

In 1966 the Association for Student Teaching and the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education co-sponsored a summer workshop, a symposium on "School-College Partnerships in Teacher Education." This conference examined carefully the relationships that should exist between schools and colleges of teacher education. Particular emphasis was given to a study of student teaching relationships. In summarizing the work of this conference, Smith et al., (1967) stated:

> Closer school and college relationships are imperative. New mechanisms and new structures are being formed. These new structures call for new roles and fundamental rearrangements of responsibilities. Schools are finding their way toward including teacher education as primary, high-priority function. Customary arrangements for student teaching are being remodeled here and there. . .for change to become progress, the ferment in teacher education needs full cooperation of schools and colleges and a fundamental review of purposes, functions, roles and responsibilities.

In a latter section of this report, the issue of school-college cooperation was stressed in relation to clinical experiences for teachers:

> The clinical experience in teacher education can be enormously strengthened through collaboration between universities and schools with support from state agencies and professional organizations. . . .A clinical approach to teaching should be a priority element in the continuing education of teachers, as well as in pre-service programs of student teaching and internship. The instructional goal for cooperative enterprise in teacher education might be stated as follows: To facilitate the realistic study of teaching in relation to theoretical propositions about teaching.

A report by Usdan and Bertolaet (1966) on the School-University Teacher Education Project is a further indictment of the failure of educational leadership. Directed by the Great Cities Research Council in cooperation with Northwestern University, this project sought to establish cooperatively operated school-college centers that would serve as the focal point for practical field experiences for teacher education. The purpose of the project was not to replace the curricula of colleges or universities, but to complement them with the necessary professional, educational, and field experiences for teachers of inner-city children. Their report states:

> Inherent in the task force reports and in the proposals that have emanated from the eleven cities is recognition of the need in teacher-training programs for experiences to acquaint prospective teachers with the gamut of social and economic problems indigenous to urban slums. If environments and economic living conditions are to be ameliorated in the large cities, the school system must play a central role. No other institution of society has comparable social penetration. The task force reports recognize the critical responsibility that educators can and must undertake in the disadvantaged areas in the large cities.

Among the areas of research in which this project was interested were: *(a)* a description of teacher behaviors, and *(b)* teacher education curricula and related experience. Research in these two areas were assigned to independent task forces. It is important to note that each task force in making assumptions for their respective programs listed the following concept as of primary importance: "No teacher-education program can be effective without the close cooperation of schools and colleges."

It would be unfair to imply that partnerships in teacher education do not now exist. The AACTE-AST workshop-symposium previously cited describes a number of cooperative programs. The Urban Semester Program initiated by the Associated Colleges of the Midwest is a specific example of such cooperation. This program provides an opportunity for students at ten Midwestern liberal arts colleges to engage in student teaching in the inner-city schools of Chicago. The city and the schools of Chicago serve as laboratories in which problems and issues in education and sociology are met face to face. Unfortunately, in view of the pressing need, such examples as this are all too few.

Third, at a time when need for educational leadership is so critical, many institutions which could provide this direction are themselves facing critical problems. Increased operating costs and the need for specialized college personnel make it increasingly difficult for many state-supported and private institutions to operate effective, comprehensive teacher education programs. Financial limitations inhibit whatever desires they might have individually to meet the urgent demands of urban school systems.

A special report by the Ford Foundation on the financial crises of colleges and universities illuminates critical problems. According to this report, the presidents of colleges overwhelmingly agree that, "the money is not now in sight to meet the rising cost of higher education. . .to serve the growing numbers of bright, qualified students. . .and to pay for the myriad activities that Americans are now demanding of their colleges and universities."

The report also makes this penetrating comment: "The real crisis will be finding the means of providing the quality, the

innovation, the pioneering that the nation needs, if its system of higher education is to meet the demands of the morrow."

It has become obvious that no longer can this nation afford the luxury of independent and isolated action on educational problems. It will take the combined efforts of all concerned institutions to meet the pressing needs so vividly apparent in our urban centers. The time for close and continuous cooperation is now; old traditions and barriers to cooperative endeavors must be eliminated. Educational institutions must all share in the interchange of ideas and work for the full utilization of resources as they seek new, cooperative solutions to these problems.

THE PLAN FOR COOPERATIVE CHANGE

It is easy to divorce theory from practice, hence develop 'theory' apart from experience. Practice without theory is limiting; theory without practice is fruitless. Edgar Dale

Seeking possible solutions to these pressing educational problems is clearly within the scope of a regional educational laboratory's responsibility. So, from the beginning of its operation, the Mid-continent Laboratory has accepted the preparation of inner-city teachers as a priority measure in meeting the problems facing urban education. In order to give meaning to the Laboratory's concept of regionality in the solution of this problem, the Laboratory immediately became involved in the larger problem of developing cooperative relationships between teacher education institutions and schools. Thus, the first task became one of formulating guiding principles for organizing cooperative ventures to effect change. Unfortunately, this task was complicated by the fact that, as Eboch (1966) states, "education has no clear idea of 'the change process.' The lack of comprehensive theory of change is evident and accepted within most other disciplines, and education must borrow most of its initial change concepts from other disciplines."

Although Eboch's statement may be generally true, educational researchers in recent years have begun to develop conceptual models and supporting principles which present logical bases for cooperative endeavors and planned change. David Clark and Egon Guba (1966) have provided much leadership in this field. They present schema for planned change which seemed relevant to the development of a cooperative program to prepare inner-city teachers. The development phase of their schema is shown in the following diagram:

Schema of Functions Necessary to the Program of Planned Change in an Institution or Social Process Field

Function	Purpose
1. *Gathering* Operational and Planning *Data*	1. To identify operational problems.
2. *Inventing Solutions* to Operating Problems	2. To solve operational problems.
3. *Engineering* Packages and *Programs* for Operational Use	3. To operationalize solutions
4. *Testing* and Evaluating Packages and *Programs*	4. To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the packages and programs

Clark and Guba (1965) believe that if a single weak link can be identified in the innovation chain, it has been in the area of development. They state:

> The primary organizational mechanism for development has been whatever resources the local school district could divert from its regular operation to support curriculum development efforts by teachers. Colleges and universities have made a meager contribution in the field through "service" operations usually housed in a unit called the bureau of field services; through the efforts of university professors generally supported by local districts via consultant fees, or by publishers; and through spotty special efforts of the school study council variety.

In discussing change strategies, Hansen (1968) recommends consideration of three major areas: *Psychological, Technical,* and *Organizational.* Discussing psychological strategies, he points out that planning for change often breaks down because people who participate do not really get involved. Failure to establish an adequate feedback cycle often hampers effective change. He concludes that "a great deal of study needs to be given in the planning process to the psychological readiness for change and the probable resistance to change, so that those who would normally oppose the change can be brought into a constructive relationship and those whose enthusiasm for change is great can realistically appraise their chances of success."

Regarding technical strategy, Hansen believes problems must be clearly analyzed and "various *change strategies* of a fairly detailed and technical nature, involving specific sequences of steps designed to move from the problem situation to a problem solution must be very carefully formulated."

In connection with organizational strategies, he states: "Although it has been said. . .that most change does not take place in educational organizations or educational enterprises as such, but in the people who are affected, it is still necessary to devise an organizational pattern that facilitates rather than blocks change." He concludes that effective long-range planning is possible only after clear-cut allocations of responsibilities among the organizations are worked out.

In addition to these concepts, Lionberger (1960) provides a practical approach to the matter of change. Summarizing research studies from the field of agriculture education, he enumerates five factors influencing the acceptance of change. These factors are:

(a) practices compatible with existing ideas and beliefs are most likely to be adopted quickly;

(b) individuals must perceive a need for the new practice;

(c) the cost of a change influences its acceptance;

(d) an easily demonstrable practice may be more quickly adopted, and

(e) the satisfied man doesn't change much.

References such as these were useful guides for planning a strategy to bring schools and institutions of higher education into a cooperative relationship. However, it must be admitted educators have not been prolific in the production of authorative statements.

Heeding Eboch's (1966) counsel to, "borrow. . .initial change concepts from other disciplines," the Laboratory made a survey of the behavioral sciences. This search for wisdom resulted in mixed emotions. According to Etzioni (1964), "there is no adequate theory of social change, just as there is no fully developed general theory of society." Moore (1963) also speaks of "the myth of a singular theory of change." It was something of a relief to learn that other disciplines have progressed little further than education in the search for a fixed, unvarying process for change, but it was disturbing to realize there were so few tested principles to serve as guides.

Despite the failure to discover a magic formula, much was gained from a study of other disciplines. Parson, Dahrendorf, Lewin, Mills, Linton, and other behavioral scientists have proposed a number of theories and principles related to the change process. Parsons (1964), for example, sees pressure for change being brought about through: *(a)* the opportunity factor which presupposes some social need or demand, *(b)* a leadership factor in which

an individual or group assumes responsibility for the organization, *(c)* the availability of facilities for utilization, and *(d)* the restructuring of the social organization.

Linton (1964) states, "the bulk of cultural progress has probably been due to the less spectacular process of gradual improvement of pre-existing devices in the development of new applications for them." He continues by saying:

> Cultural change is mainly a matter of the replacement of old elements by new ones, and every culture normally includes adequate techniques for meeting all the conscious needs of the society's members. When a new trait presents itself, its acceptance depends not so much on whether it is better than the existing one as on whether it is enough better to make its acceptance worth the trouble. This in turn must depend upon the judgment of the group, their degree of conservatism, and how much change in existing habits the new appliance will entail.

In discussing the problem of changing levels of conduct in a society, Lewin (1964) believes two basic methods may be used: *(a)* adding forces to bring change in the desired direction, or *(b)* diminishing forces opposed to change. He concludes that either method might bring change to the same new level. However, he states:

> The secondary effect should, however, be quite different. In the first case the process on the new level would be accompanied by a state of relatively high tension; in the second case by a state of relatively low tension. Since increase of tension above a certain degree is likely to be paralleled by higher aggressiveness, higher emotionality, and lower constructiveness, it is clear that as a rule the second method will be preferable to the higher pressure method.

Acting on the assumption that these principles were basically valid, the Laboratory worked to develop a strategy to facilitate cooperative efforts to prepare teachers for inner-city schools. It seemed necessary to involve higher education and public school personnel to the fullest extent possible. This conclusion was dictated by the theoretical considerations set forth by the behavioral scientist and by the practical realization that participating institutions would have the final authority for approving programs related to their personnel. The Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory could serve primarily as a catalyst in the distillation

of new ideas, it could provide non-partisan leadership designed to promote the objective consideration of new ideas, and it could also provide financial support to encourage institutions to undertake a high-risk, innovative program.

On the basis of these conclusions, a plan was evolved which provided both a structure for the cooperative solution to problems and a set of principles to guide interaction among group members. It was hypothesized that goals would be effectively attained by proceeding through five stages.

Stage 1: Awareness of need. School personnel see problems of staffing inner-city schools from one perspective. They are conscious of their needs and are faced with a wide range of immediate problems. College personnel view the problem of preparing teachers from a different perspective. Their immediate concern is with the pressing needs, often financial, of the individual institutions. Although they may see the problems of public schools with varying degrees of clarity, they have a somewhat different interest in the problem and a different level of concern. The Laboratory's staff could see both points of view and could provide an awareness of the need on a broader, national scope. The source of the awareness and the perspective from which need was viewed was considered unimportant; the fact that awareness existed was considered the important factor.

Stage 2: Availability of data. Realization of a need without available sources of information for the resolution of the need was believed to produce only failure and frustration. Individuals can be involved in intelligent solutions to problems only if they have adequate, pertinent data. It was hypothesized that public schools and colleges could furnish much of the data upon which to base intelligent solutions. The Laboratory, through its information service and its contacts with consultants at the national level, could cooperate in providing additional data.

Stage 3: Determination of alternatives. Providing a sufficient amount of relevant data should result in an increased number of alternatives open to a group. It was assumed there are usually a

number of different solutions which might bring about desired change or achieve a common goal. Since a cooperative venture, including groups not heretofore accustomed to working together. can be a tender, fragile creation, care must be taken that no one group appear to plead its special interests or seek to limit alternatives.

Stage 4: Reaching a decision. It was believed participating institutions could resolve differences and achieve a common solution to most problems, provided agreement was reached that there was a pressing need, that data were available, and that alternatives were clearly set forth and seriously considered. It was realized that all decisions must reflect a respect for the integrity and autonomy of each participating institution.

Stage 5: Implementation of change. It was hypothesized that reaching a decision involved mental assent, but implementation of the decision required active participation. After decisions were made by the group, it would be necessary for the administrative personnel of the individual institutions to approve these decisions and take necessary steps to implement them. This stage was thought to be the critical point in the process. Just as there are many more religious individuals decrying the prevalence of sin than there are those actively combating it, there seems to be more educators willing to condemn current practice than there are those taking positive steps to effect change.

Implicit in the five stages described above are assumptions concerning the process involved in accomplishing goals. No attempt was made to compose an exhaustive set of principles. However, the following principles appeared to be of major significance:

(a) persons who are to be most affected by change must have the opportunity to be involved in the decision-making process;

(b) persons will not change until they perceive that their present behavior is inadequate to achieve their desired goals; change will be effected only to the extent that persons understand the need for such change;

(c) activities to accomplish change will depend on an individual's perception of the present situation; his perceptions are formed by his previous experiences;

(d) persons will change only to the extent they feel change poses no real threat to them;

(e) persons feel less threatened and become more willing to accept change as they become better acquainted with, and develop greater confidence in, individuals and organizations who may wish to accomplish change;

(f) personal contacts and face to face relationships will provide the most effective means for reducing the threatening aspects of change for those persons who are directly concerned.

Fortified with a planning grant from the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and these evolving strategies, Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory staff members prepared to launch a cooperative program to prepare teachers for inner-city schools. College representatives exhibited a sincere interest in developing a teacher education program relevant to urban needs, and all planning-session participants showed an openness to innovative ideas which gave promise of producing a significant contribution to education.

PROCEDURES FOR COOPERATIVE ACTION

Creative organizations or societies are rarely tidy. Some tolerance for inconsistencies, for profusion of purposes and strategies, and for conflict is the price of freedom and vitality. John Gardner

If the above statement by Gardner were to be used as the sole criterion, the Cooperative Urban Teacher Education program could well be classified as a creative organization. It did not spring into full bloom as a tightly organized program where data were fed computer-like into a well-oiled machine with neatly punched decisions forthcoming. Fortunately, individual and group tolerance for inconsistencies was more than sufficient to overcome the minor conflicts that arose, so a vital, creative organization resulted.

Cooperation Among Educational Institutions

The first meeting of persons interested in urban teacher preparation in the Kansas City region took place in the latter part of July 1966. The enthusiasm generated at this meeting encouraged the Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory to plan seriously for a cooperative program. During the fall and winter months regular meetings were held, and by spring the Kansas City program became a reality.

Since the Laboratory had a commitment to educational institutions within its entire region, exploratory meetings were held in the spring of 1967 to ascertain interest in creating similar programs in Wichita and Oklahoma City. These meetings clearly indicated an enthusiasm on the part of educational leaders from these two metropolitan regions. However, because of a sharply reduced budget, it became necessary for the Laboratory to reduce the scope of its plans and limit its initial activities to the Kansas City program.

Rather than abdicate its responsibility for improving inner-city teacher education, however, the Laboratory wrote a proposal to develop cooperative programs in the Wichita and Oklahoma City regions and submitted it to the Danforth Foundation for possible funding. In February 1968, the proposal was approved and funded. The Laboratory sought immediately to rekindle interest and to develop procedures to extend the program to Wichita and Oklahoma City. These efforts were successful, and in January 1969, programs were initiated at the two additional sites.

Although program development at the three sites was coordinated by the Laboratory, and although many similarities exist, each program was developed in terms of the basic needs of the region as perceived by representatives from participating institutions. Most problems requiring cooperative action were common to each region; the solutions differed somewhat in detail. It would seem reasonable to assume that institutions in other sections of the country interested in developing cooperative programs would be faced with similar problems. A description of these problems and their resolution should be of interest to the educational community.

Developing an Organization

Formation of the Urban Teacher Education Committee is considered the key to the development of the Cooperative Urban Teacher Education program. At each site this committee was composed of one representative from each participating school system and institution of higher education. Public school personnel were considered an integral part of each committee, and in each center they have often assumed leadership roles. For instance, the Kansas City Division of Urban Education was instrumental in establishing the original program. Without the active cooperation of its director and the continuing asistance of its personnel, the program would never have been initiated.

Representatives to the committees were selected by the administration of each participating institution, and no effort was

made by the Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory to dictate membership. Each committee selected one of its own members as committee chairman. The operation of each committee has varied somewhat from site to site, and there is evidence that an organizational "evolutionary process" appears to be taking place.

The Kansas City program was originally composed of 13 liberal arts colleges, 2 public school systems, the Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory, and a representative from the Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education.

As institutions not included in the original planning group began to show interest in the developing program, the committee established a policy of accepting interested institutions willing to abide by existing regulations and procedures. During the planning period, a state university and two additional liberal arts colleges were added. Since the program was begun in September 1967, two liberal arts colleges, a state-supported institution, and a parochial school system have joined the cooperative effort. The Urban Teacher Education Committee selected the McREL representative to serve as temporary chairman. He served in this capacity until programs were organized in Wichita and Oklahoma City. At that time he became coordinator of the overall program and a college representative was selected as chairman.

During the first 18 months of the Kansas City program, the Committee held monthly meetings. In the eyes of the Committee, the time required for these meetings became excessive, and it was agreed that an Executive Committee composed of seven members would be selected to continue monthly meetings, while the entire Committee would meet once each semester.

The Cooperative Urban Teacher Education program of Kansas is composed of 11 liberal arts colleges, the Wichita public school system, the Catholic Diocese of Wichita, and a representative from the Associated Colleges of Central Kansas, a consortium of colleges in central Kansas. The original impetus for organizing the Kansas program came from the Laboratory's area center

coordinator located in Wichita. When it became necessary for the Laboratory to close area centers, this individual joined the administrative staff of the Wichita public school system, where he continued efforts to initiate the program. He rejoined the Laboratory in order to direct the Kansas program when foundation support was secured. The Wichita Urban Teacher Education Committee scheduled regular monthly dinner meetings to guide program operation.

The Oklahoma City program is composed of three liberal arts institutions, five public colleges and universities, and the Oklahoma City public school system. The Committee selected as its chairman a representative from one of the public universities. Although the Committee held monthly meetings during the organizational period, meetings have occurred less frequently since that time. It would appear that, over a long period of time, extremely close ties have been developed between the Oklahoma City public school system and the higher education institutions of that region. Several former public school administrative personnel are now employed at neighboring institutions of higher education. Perhaps, for these reasons, a greater spirit of cooperation already existed in the region. Whatever the cause may be, the public school system has assumed an extremely active role in formulating the program and in assuming financial responsibility for its maintenance.

Financial Support

Funds for initiating the program came from diverse sources: the Mid-continent Regional Educational Labortory, the Danforth Foundation, the Multi-Purpose Training Center of the University of Missouri–Kansas City, and Title XI of the National Defense Education Act. However, one of the most encouraging aspects of the program's development has been the financial commitment by participating schools and colleges. Early in the Kansas City planning phase, when it appeared that sufficient funding could not be found outside the group, colleges agreed to rebate a portion of each participating student's tuition to support the activity. This procedure has been followed at both extension sites.

In addition to this support, public schools in each program have cooperated fully in providing resource persons from their special services staffs to assist in the instructional program. Office and seminar facilities are provided by the public school systems in two centers. The school systems of Kansas City, Missouri and Kansas, share in the payment of supervising teachers, while the Oklahoma City school system has contributed three-fourths of the instructional staff, video equipment, technicians, and many other services.

This financial support by participating schools and colleges would seem to indicate the depth of commitment to the program at each center.

Content of the Program

It was agreed that the program would consist of one semester to be spent entirely in an urban center. Content for the program was developed by each staff to meet the requirements of participating institutions. A fuller explanation of course content is contained in a monograph published by the Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory in March 1969, entitled *Innovation in the Inner-City*. Briefly, each center approved a semester program which consisted of the following activities:

(a) orientation to educational problems of large, urban communities by cooperating public school personnel;

(b) visits to schools and homes in inner-city communities;

(c) conferences with personnel from public and private agencies concerned with problems of an urban-deprived society;

(d) contacts with inner-city children through classroom observation, playground supervision, tutorial programs, and community center activities;

(e) seminars coordinated with each of the field experiences, which were designed to provide an opportunity to reach tentative solutions to sociological, psychological, and educational problems encountered in the field experiences, and

(f) an extended period of full-day student teaching in an inner-city school under the supervision of experienced inner-city teachers and Urban Teacher Education staff members.

Although each center accepted the major concepts developed by the Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory and built the instructional program around them, specific activities, designed to teach an understanding of these concepts, were varied in each site as the available resources and peculiar circumstances of each metropolitan community required.

Selection of Faculty Members

Selection of faculty members for the Cooperative Urban Teacher Education program posed special problems. Staff members teach course content for which participating institutions grant academic credit, assign and supervise student teachers, and provide participating institutions with an evaluation of the student's progress. Since staff members, in a very real sense, are representatives of the participating institutions, it was necessary that they be approved by these institutions and recommended for enployment. The Laboratory also reserved the right to approve staff members.

The extent of cooperative relationships among participating institutions is indicated by the faculty members selected at each site. Each center has a director with teaching responsibilities, and in each of the three centers, this person had been previously employed by the public school system in which the center is located. A majority of the staff members selected were drawn from participating institutions or universities located in the metropolitan center. Racially, each staff reflects a degree of integration not normally found on college campuses.

Eligibility for the Program

At each site it was agreed that the program would be open to qualified student volunteers from participating institutions, that students would be admitted to the program upon the recommendation of their home institutions, and that each candidate

would have to have the approval of the teacher education committee or the department of education on his home campus. It was further agreed, at all sites that married students would be eligible for the program. In Wichita and Kansas City it was agreed that both elementary and secondary applicants would be accepted. Secondary education majors would be required to have the approval of the chairman of the department in which the student was majoring.

The Urban Teacher Education Committee at Oklahoma City has restricted admission to the program to elementary education majors only. Because of the large number of teacher education candidates attending state-supported institutions, this Committee further agreed to establish a quota of participating students from each institution.

Enrollment and Academic Credit

Since participating institutions are responsible for granting academic credit to their students, it was decided that students would follow regular enrollment procedures of their institutions. Each committee agreed that students should receive a semester of academic credit from their home institutions to be divided among student teaching, education, urban sociology, and psychology courses at the discretion of the individual institution. Because course titles and education requirements vary among participating institutions, it was agreed that each institution would have sole responsibility for granting academic credit. Although the course loads of students may vary, a policy was established at each center requiring all students to participate in the entire program regardless of the courses in which they might be enrolled and the amount of college credit they might be receiving.

Tuition and Costs

Students pay regular tuition fees to their respective institutions for the semester they participate in the program. Their eligibility for scholarship aid and loans is unimpaired by participation in the program. There was general agreement that the cost of

participating in the Cooperative Urban Teacher Education program should be no greater than the cost for a comparable period of study on campus.

Provisions for housing have varied at each site. Since the majority of students participating in the Oklahoma City program are residents of the Oklahoma City area, the Committee finally agreed to make no provision for housing in a centralized location. Since the large majority of students in the Wichita program are from institutions outside the Wichita area, it was agreed that students would be housed in a private dormitory located on the edge of the defined inner-city community. Room and board are provided by the dormitory management. Office space and seminar facilities are likewise provided in the same building. The Urban Teacher Education Committee in Kansas City has adopted a middle course. Since about half the participating students are residents of the Kansas City area, the Committee has recommended several apartments with the approval of participating institutions, but students are not required to live in these locations.

Cooperation With Non-Educational Organizations

After the initial planning phase was completed, the staff began to develop a comprehensive program of field experiences. Provision for these experiences necessitated cooperative ties with social and civic agencies in each metropolitan center. The response from these non-educational agencies was enthusiastic, and this report would be incomplete without some mention of their contributions.

Ties with the Human Relations Commission of Kansas City were particularly close. Their office scheduled tours, provided speakers from the inner-city community, and opened the doors of other civic agencies seeking to alleviate the distress of impoverished families. The Jackson County Detention Home and the Western Missouri Mental Health Center served as laboratories where students could gain a fuller understanding of inner-city children with problems.

Churches and community groups, such as the Kansas City Westside Community Council, have shown an interest in the program, and cooperative arrangements have been developed which enable students to work in tutoring programs and community center activities. From these continuing contacts have come increased mutual understanding and respect on the part of all participants.

Civic rights organizations, the Black Industrial and Economic Union, and the Human Resource Commission have given generously of their time to explain their goals and to interact with CUTE students. During the past semester, students in Kansas City have been assigned to Vista Volunteers for the purpose of enhancing their understanding of inner-city life.

The Cooperative Urban Teacher Education program of Kansas has likewise received the whole-hearted support of civic and community agencies. The Wichita city manager, city commissioners, police department officials, and county welfare representatives have served as resource persons for the program. Model Cities officials, Community Action Center personnel, and civil rights organizations have been active participants in the various field experiences.

In addition to groups such as these, the Oklahoma City League of Women Voters volunteered their services as observers to collect research data on teaching behaviors. Many hours in training time and in field observations were donated by these women.

These cooperative enterprises have served to make the entire metropolitan community an expanded "learning laboratory." Inner-city residents often have become participating staff members in the Cooperative Urban Teacher Education program. These individuals and organizations have provided invaluable services to the program by creating opportunities for students to know and interact with members of the inner-city community. At the same time, students reciprocate by rendering volunteer services as tutors and recreational leaders. Truly it is a marriage of common interests, with both parties benefiting from the union.

ORGANIZING A COOPERATIVE PROGRAM

The techniques used to organize the Cooperative Urban Teacher Education program have proved successful in three separate sites. Based on the results of three years' experience, the Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory believes use of the following guidelines will enable institutions in other regions to form cooperative arrangements to promote successful inner-city teacher education programs.

Step 1: Initiating the Cooperative Concept

Although a cooperative program involves the participation of many educational institutions, it usually will be necessary for one institution to stimulate interest, to formulate tentative plans for group consideration, and to establish contacts with other agencies and institutions within a region.

Step 2: Contacting Interested Institutions

Initial meetings to consider development of a cooperative program should include persons who can make commitments for their respective institutions. Without administrative support from interested institutions, further consideration of a program becomes truly "academic."

Step 3: Organizing an Advisory Committee

After a group of institutions have made a commitment to support a cooperative inner-city teacher education program, an advisory committee representing participating institutions should be formed. This committee should function in a policy-making capacity. It should be responsible for developing the program, for selecting participants, for approving the instructional staff, and for determining the general policies guiding program operations.

Step 4: Establishing the Program

Many important cooperative decisions must be made in initiating a program. Although the peculiar circumstances of a given locality will dictate what decisions are necessary, the following major problems will be faced by nearly every group.

A. *Financial Support* The advisory committee must resolve this question early in the developmental process. Each institution must be willing to assume an equitable share of the financial burden. Contributions may be in the form of tuition, reimbursement, use of school facilities, support from foundations or governmental sources, or joint use of faculty members from participating institutions.

B. *Instructional Staff* The advisory committee should be responsible for selecting the staff. Since the staff members function as agents of each participating institution, they should meet the standards of these institutions.

C. *Student Participation* Agreement must be reached as to policies governing admission to the program. Since student teaching is an integral part of the program, students obviously must meet institutional requirements for this phase of the teacher education program.

D. *Academic Calendar* Time alloted for the semester field experience must reflect the calendar arrangements of participating institutions. But while dates for beginning and ending semesters usually vary among individual institutions, a minimum of 16 weeks is essential for effective operation of the program.

E. *Academic Credit* Provisions should be made for a full semester of college credit. The advisory committee may wish to standardize credit offered through the program, or it may permit each institution to determine course credit for individual students. Since teacher education course names vary from institution to institution and

since students' needs differ, the latter alternative is recommended. Students should participate in all facets of the program regardless of credit actually received.

F. *Curriculum Content* The advisory committee should be responsible for approving curriculum content. Ideally the program should include content related to mental health, sociology, and teacher education. A monograph prepared by the Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory provides information regarding the curriculum guidelines which have been field tested in three Midwestern centers.

G. *Facilities* The program should be located in, or adjacent to, inner-city educational facilities. It appears advantageous to house students in one centralized location. Such housing enhances interactions among students and establishes a supportive environment.

H. *Student Costs* The program should be organized in such fashion that students pay no more for this experience than they would for a comparable period on campus.

Step 5: Securing Cooperation from Non-Educational Organizations

A successful inner-city teacher education program must draw heavily on the resources of the urban community. A staff member should be given responsibility for contacting the many non-educational organizations involved in inner-city activities and securing the necessary cooperation.

Step 6: Providing for Continuing Contacts with Graduates of the Program

Experience indicates that many students, after completing the program, will accept teaching positions in local inner-city schools. Experience also indicates that these graduates actively seek to continue a close relationship with the program and its staff. It is recommended that the advisory committee plan ways to

encourage continuing contacts with these new teachers; they need support during their first year of experience and can contribute valuable feedback to the staff.

PERCEPTIONS OF URBAN TEACHER EDUCATION REPRESENTATIVES

The proof of the pudding is in the eating. Cervantes

Cooperative activities to effect change in the preparation of inner-city teachers can be reconstructed by analyzing the minutes of Urban Teacher Education Committee meetings, inter-office memos, and pertinent correspondence. This approach presents the facts, but it tends to be somewhat sterile. It omits the perceptions, feelings, and concerns of individuals intimately involved in the planning process. A complete picture of the Cooperative Urban Teacher Education program must include these perceptions as well as the organizational details.

In order to present an accurate reflection of these opinions, semi-structured, tape-recorded interviews were conducted. Representatives from the three centers who had been most active in program development consented to record their observations. These interviews provide a subjective evaluation of the Cooperative Urban Teacher Education program activities from the institutional vantage point. Because a careful analysis of these conversations revealed five major areas of interest relevant to this monograph, this summary contains statements by these representatives grouped according to the five topics discussed most frequently in the interviews. Participants in these interviews spoke as individuals and did not attempt to serve as spokesman for their colleagues. However, these statements are believed to be representative of the general attitudes expressed frequently by other Urban Teacher Education Committee members.

The Curriculum

> I get the idea from our CUTE students that they think they are getting more than they would have received had they stayed on campus. They are measuring this by comparing what they're getting in CUTE and what the other students are getting on campus. These young people are

old enough—mature enough—that they can analyze fairly well what's happening to them.

The most beneficial aspects of the program have to do with mental health and sociology. It would be possible for us to do these kinds of things on campus, but I doubt that we'd be able to do it efficiently. For instance, the psychiatrist is available twice a week. They meet with him individually and in groups and they are able to work out their problems. The students have told me that this is one of the strongest parts of the program as far as they are concerned. As far as sociology is concerned, they feel strongly about the fact they are involved in various activities which enable them to learn more about inner-city living. Through their visits, the actual facts are brought to their attention. They become emotionally involved, and the experiences have a greater meaning for them than they would otherwise.

We've had limited opportunity to talk with our students, and we have heard some complaints from time to time. They felt some of the seminars or some of the things being done were a complete waste of time. But by and large, I think that most of them are very favorable toward the program. Our students probably go into CUTE without any sociology and probably a weak background in psychology so that in those two areas they are looking at territories they have never even dreamed about before. It's been a new experience for most of them, and I think these students have an advantage.

Continued Operation Without Outside Funding

From the public school point of view, this is a good recruitment program. I can justify the expenditure of funds partly on this basis. Also, the things we learn from the pre-service program would have value for in-service education of our teachers.

That's a real tough one. We have anticipated this possibility and have tried to explore it. But as a private institution, we are in a real financial bind. We are making no faculty additions for the next year. If the Federal support is gone, the college would certainly have to help make it up. I would think maybe the school board would work out something, but they are in financial straits too, maybe even worse than the colleges.

If the Laboratory had to drop out, the various cooperating institutions would have to contribute more heavily than they do. However, I think it would be possible for them to support it because of the number involved in the program. In other words I don't think it would be a burden on any one institution. We need to look into other kinds of funding because we realize the Laboratory will not stay with us forever, and we definitely want to see the program continue.

The only thing I can say is that I've had no difficulty in getting financial support for this effort. I doubt if the financial support we are

giving is a major part of what it's costing to operate the program. We will continue to make some money available. We want to stay in this, and I think maybe we might be able to convince the administration it's enough of an improvement that they should be willing to continue this effort.

Participation in Decision-Making

I think the most crucial thing is having someone who is very interested, someone who is influential on his own campus and also has a high degree of interest. A top administrator with just a mild or vague sort of interest in the program would be less effective than someone with less authority but with a high degree of interest.

One thing we did that I think helped in the original planning was to include someone from the state certification department. That was good thinking because they could have cut this thing down immediately. Of course, the state superintendent is on McREL's board and that helps. The fact he was included in the very beginning, and not after it was all planned, was a big help.

In most cases the representatives have the complete backing of their adminstration. Most of them are department chairmen in the teacher education programs. I think there is an advantage in having the executive committee. We will probably be rotating these people; they won't serve for more than a year or two. Then all the people in the program will get the chance to be in on decisions. I think you'll find we pretty well agree with the whole thing.

The only public school people on the Urban Teacher Education Committee are the superintendent and myself, but it was wise to have us in on the planning. I think it's a mistake to get people who can't say yes or no without going back to someone else. In other words, we can make a decision, but if we had someone who didn't have this authority, it would present problems. Of course, this is part of the problem some colleges have had; their representatives weren't the deans; they weren't the governing boards, and their administration did not give them the authority to speak for the institution.

Expected Outcomes

More teachers are being placed in the inner city out of our colleges because of the CUTE program. Another benefit is that it does awaken students to the reality of the inner city to a greater extent than can be done here on campus. I think our teaching on campus has been affected by the CUTE program, too. I see us moving toward an adoption of CUTE techniques and involvement of the psychology and sociology

departments. Then, as far as the institutions are concerned, I think we have learned that we can cooperate in other kinds of programs with these institutions. I think that the mere fact we are in CUTE has helped us to appreciate this and has helped us to expand our cooperative efforts.

The students that have been in the program seem to want to stay in it, and they seem to have a kind of "missionary zeal" to convert other people. They are back on campus talking to other students, telling them about what's going on in the inner city. Maybe a better general understanding of what's happening in the inner-city school will come out of this. At least that's what I'm hoping.

Student participants will take assignments in inner-city schools. Many of them will remain in our system. They are better able to assume classroom responsibilities because of the program.

Problems

The program should be expanded both in the number of students participating and in length of time. All prospective teachers should have experiences like these, and we need a full year for the program.

The matter of recruitment into the program is a persistent problem. I think we have been a little slow in developing our techniques for interesting students.

I think it would be better if students all lived in one location. But presently they don't. Living together they could establish better relationships with one another and help one another solve their mutual problems. I think there should be much greater effort in finding a place where they can all be together.

Some of the students are experiencing individual problems related to academic requirements of their institutions. During the first week of the program, one student would say to another, 'You know, I'm earning 17 hours credit for this, how many are you earning?'. . . .'Fifteen hours.' One college is requiring one of their students to come back and take a certain methods course in science, while other students do not have to take other course work during the semester. This has created friction and it's probably created pressure on certain colleges.

These comments appear to reflect a keen awareness of the need for new dimensions in teacher education. They seem also to typify the commitment of institutions to the concept of cooperation. Although it may be more enthusiastic than most, the following statement summarizes the spirit of educators in the Mid-continent region who have made the program successful:

I would rather see our program change to be more like the CUTE program than to see the CUTE program change to that of ours. I feel strongly there is a shift in the roles of teachers and students toward more active involvement in the educational process. I feel very enthusiastic about the seminar-type program being used. I think we need to prepare more teachers in this way, and the need is so drastic that I'll go to bat to make sure we provide our end of it. I think the program is so far ahead of what we're doing that my attention is directed more to what seems to be our deficiency. I'm quite enthusiastic about the CUTE program.

EPILOGUE

This monograph contains an analytical description of one program involving cooperative activities undertaken in the Mid-continent region. An effort has been made to state clearly the underlying assumptions which determined procedures, some of the major issues which were successfully resolved, perceptions of representatives from participating institutions, and guidelines for institutions interested in developing cooperative programs. The Laboratory believes that these procedures, used under similar conditions in other localities, will yield equally gratifying results.

The analysis of these activities during the past three years has been valuable in planning other cooperative Laboratory ventures related to urban teacher education. There are indications that the program has achieved some measure of success. The following empirical evidence provides support for this belief:

First, since its inception, the number of institutions participating in the Kansas City program has increased 50 percent. In Wichita, plans are now under way to provide an orderly means for including additional interested institutions, and the Wichita center has worked out plans to accept students from an institution of higher education outside the Mid-continent region. Oklahoma City has found it necessary to impose a quota on the number of students selected from each participating institution. Urban Teacher Education Committees at all centers are faced with the problem of finding means to accommodate the increased number of student volunteers.

Second, institutions clustered around other metropolitan centers have discussed with the Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory the possibility of extending the program to their communities. Many inquiries have come from individual institutions throughout the United States and from Canada. Expansion of the program into other cities is now being planned.

Third, based on the success of these initial ventures, additional cooperative activities are now under way. In Kansas City and Wichita the initiation of a staff development school is in the discussion stage. Such a development would enable graduates of present Cooperative Urban Teacher Education programs to spend their first year of teaching in a single school, providing continued mutual emotional and professional support for graduates. They would be under the daily supervision of outstanding, experienced, inner-city teachers and also would be involved in regular CUTE-type, in-service seminars during this period. Public schools, universities, and representatives of Model Cities programs in these locations are cooperating with Mid-continent Laboratory personnel in these discussions.

Fourth, the Kansas City area already has begun a move to provide educational experiences relevant to urban problems to other fields of professional preparation. The Kansas City Regional Council on Higher Education, a college consortium, is planning a program based generally on Cooperative Urban Teacher Education concepts to provide a similar experience for students majoring in sociology and related social work fields. The development of a center for urban field studies of this type would seem to provide a logical home for the CUTE program when outside funding ceases. Such a center, designed for training the many college students whose professional preparation will draw them to the city, could be effectively supported by a college consortium. The concept of cooperative programs located in metropolitan centers could play a vital role in alleviating the financing distress of the smaller, private institutions of higher education.

It seems appropriate to conclude this monograph on a note of caution sounded by Daniel Levine of the Kansas City Urban Teacher Education Committee. He stated, "If our colleges use this program to do cooperatively what we cannot do as individual institutions, it will be a good program and will succeed, but if we send only a few students and then claim our obligation to urban education has been fulfilled, we will have forfeited all claim to educational and moral leadership."

Applied merely as a balm to the conscience, cooperative programs will provide participating institutions with no more than a facade of social concern. As a means for a comprehensive attack on urban problems, cooperation can be an effective key to urban teacher education.

REFERENCES

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. *Partnership in teacher education.* Washington, D.C.: Author, 1967.

Clark, D. & Guba, E. An examination of potential change roles in education. Seminar on Innovation in Planning School Curricula, National Institute for Study of Educational Change, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana, 1965.

Clark, D. & Guba, E. Effecting change in institutions of higher learning. *UCEA International Intervisitation Program,* University Council for Educational Administration, University of Ohio, Columbus, Ohio, 1966.

Clotnier, G.M. & Lawson, J.H. *Innovation in the inner-city.* Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory, Kansas City, 1969, 1 (1).

Eboch, S. The study of change as a concept in education. *Theory into practice,* 1966, 15 (1).

Etxioni, A. & Etxioni, E. (Eds.) *Social change.* New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1964.

Ford Foundation: Editorial Projects for Education, Inc. The plain fact is. . . .Washington, D.C.: Author, 1968.

Hansen, K. *Planning for educational change: A statewide approach,* Unpublished Manuscript, Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory library, 1968.

Klopf, G.J. & Bowman, G.W. Teacher education in a social context. New York: Mental Health Materials Center, Inc., 1966.

Lewin, K. Group dynamics and social change. In Etzioni and Etzioni (Eds.), *Social change.* New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1964.

Linton, R. Discovery, invention, and their cultural setting. In Etzioni and Etzioni (Eds.), *Social change.* New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1964.

Lionberger, H. *Adoption of new ideas and practices.* Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University Press, 1960.

McClosky, E. *Urban disadvantaged pupils: A synthesis of 99 research reports.* The Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, Portland, Oregon, 1967.

Moore, W. *Social change.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963.

Parsons, T. A functional theory of change. In Etzioni and Etzioni (Eds.), *Social change,* New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1964.

Usdan, M.D. & Bertolaet, F. *Teachers for the disadvantaged.* Chicago: Follet Publishing Company, 1966.